

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virignia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 09/848,046 05/03/2001 YAMAP0594USA 5579 Yasumori Hino EXAMINER 7590 04/14/2004 Mark D. Saralino ANGEBRANNDT, MARTIN J RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT Nineteenth Floor 1621 Euclid Avenue 1756 Cleveland, OH 44115-2191

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			4
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	_
Advisory Action	09/848,046	HINO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Martin J Angebranndt	1756	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 31 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eithe condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114	to avoid abandonment of this r: (1) a timely filed amendme peal (with appeal fee); or (3)	application. A proper reply to a nt which places the application in	
PERIOD FOR	R REPLY [check either a) or b	p)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of no event, however, will the statutory period for reply ex ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ender a property of the period of	this Advisory Action, or (2) the date spire later than SIX MONTHS from the WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH. The date on which the petition und riod of extension and the correspondate of the shortened statutory period of Office later than three months afte	ne mailing date of the final rejection. IS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP or 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extensions amount of the fee. The appropriate extensions for reply originally set in the final Office action;	ion sion
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appells 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37			
2. X The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	ed because:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require f	urther consideration and/or s	earch (see NOTE below);	
(b) ⊠ they raise the issue of new matter (see No			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	ion in better form for appeal b	y materially reducing or simplifying th	е
(d) they present additional claims without car	nceling a corresponding num	per of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	ejection(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) we canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	ould be allowable if submitted	l in a separate, timely filed amendmen	t
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ reques application in condition for allowance because		n considered but does NOT place the	
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	because it is not directed SC	LELY to issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendr explanation of how the new or amended claim	ment(s) a)⊠ will not be enter is would be rejected is provid	ed or b)⊡ will be entered and an ed below or appended.	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follo	ws:		
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: 7-12.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a)		red by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure State		•	
0. Other:	(),	<u> </u>	

Martin J Angebranndt Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1756

Whitap

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The language is newly proposed and speicifally clouds the issue with respect to the 35 USC 112 rejection. The language describes the trace as being ".... a data region in a track".

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The position of the examiner is that the use of the second bean in forming a tracking groove is clearly disclosed in the specification, while the formation of pits is not. The applicant has requested that this rejection be obviated, but it seems that the issue may merely be shifted to the independent claims in the propsed amendment. The formation of clock information is clearly data, but not user data. The proposed amendment does not provide a distinction over the references applied.

2